



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,588	08/01/2001	Juergen Wrede	10191/1899	5996

26646 7590 05/13/2005

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/920,588

Applicant(s)

WREDE, JUERGEN

Examiner

Shawki S. Ismail

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. Claims 1-20 remain for further examination. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 filed on April 4, 2005 have been fully considered.

The old rejection maintained

2. The rejection is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on October 4, 2005. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive; therefore, the old rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 9-16, and 18-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brunemann et al, (Brunemann)** U.S. Paten No. **6,487,717** and in view of **Tsumura** U.S. Patent No. **6,018,726**.

5. As to claims 1, 2, and 13, Brunemann teaches a method for transmitting data between a respective data processing unit on a provider side and a respective data processing unit on a user side, the respective data processing unit on the provider side

Art Unit: 2155

and the respective data processing unit on the user side in each case being operatively connected to a respective transmitting/receiving device for at least one of wireless transmission and wireless reception of data (abstract.) Brunemann teaches a memory location and database for storing of data received at both the user and provider side (see Fig. 2 and Fig. 3). However, Brunemann does not explicitly teach a buffer storage for storing the data. Brunemann does not explicitly teach loading the stored data into the processing unit of the user and provider side only during an existence of a predefined operating state.

Tsumura teaches a system for automatically billing information services in conjunction with utilities services. The system includes a main unit and terminal unit. The terminal units receive data of various type tagged with a unique data identification code and they are also provided with a utilization status counter for storing data identification codes of data actually executed. A buffer is utilized for temporarily storing transmitted or received data (col. 7, lines 29-65). Stored data is then loaded to the processing unit to calculate service fees based on the stored data when the main unit transmits the appropriate data at regular intervals (col. 2, lines 45-60.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Brunemann and Tsumura to use a buffer to store data received and then to load the data based on predefined operating state because it is faster and would reduce the processing time. A buffer acts as a flow control, which would transmit the data at a speed that the receiving unit can handle, which would otherwise cause overflow.

Art Unit: 2155

6. As to claims 3 and 14, Brunemann teaches the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the data is one of a program and software (col. 2, lines 33-41).

7. As to claims 4 and 15, Brunemann teaches the method as recited in claim 2 wherein the respective data processing unit on the provider side is a server (col. 4, lines 13-20).

8. As to claims 5 and 16, Brunemann teaches the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the respective data processing unit on the user side is a programmable control unit in a motor vehicle (col. 3, lines 57-66).

9. Claims 6-8, and 17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brunemann et al, (Brunemann)** U.S. Paten No. **6,487,717** and in view of **Levy** U.S. Patent No **5,493,676**.

10. As to claims 6-8, and 17, Brunemann teaches a method for transmitting data between a respective data processing unit on a provider side and a respective data processing unit on a user side, the respective data processing unit on the provider side and the respective data processing unit on the user side in each case being operatively connected to a respective transmitting/receiving device for at least one of wireless transmission and wireless reception of data (abstract). Brunemann does not explicitly teach a predefinable operating state of the vehicle where it is at least one of i) the motor vehicle is stationary, ii) a parking brake is set, iii) an ignition is switched off, iv) a driving switch is turned off, and v) an ignition key is withdrawn. Brunemann also does not explicitly teach maintaining a power supply of the respective data processing unit on the

Art Unit: 2155

user side for a pre-settable time after at least one of: i) switching off the ignition, and ii) withdrawing the ignition key of the motor vehicle.

Levy teaches a system and method for charging for vehicle parking through the use of mobile parking units. Each of the mobile units checks its location whenever the vehicle is not moving and if the location coincides with a known parking area, a charge for parking is activated until the vehicle resumes traveling (col. 2, lines 11-27). The power delay unit maintains power to the mobile unit for as many hours as the timer was set for starting from the time the ignition switch is switched off (col. 11, lines 30-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Brunemann and Levy to use predefinable operating state of the vehicle to load data into the processing unit on the user side and to maintain a power supply of the processing unit for a pre-settable time after the ignition has been turned off because doing so will make it easier to use the vehicle's sensors as the predefinable operating state. The sensor are already available and would not require as much work to download the data off of them or to manipulate them as one sees fit.

11. As to claims 9, 10 and 17, it contains similar limitations as in claim 1; therefore it is rejected under the same rationale.

12. As to claims 11 and 19, Brunemann teaches the method as recited in 9, wherein the central vehicle computer is connected via a bi-directional data bus to at least one data processing unit on the user side (col. 5, lines 36-60).

13. As to claims 12 and 20, Brunemann teaches the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the respective data processing unit on the user side includes at least one of: an engine management, an ABS system, an ELB system, an electronic stability program, a pneumatic suspension, a transmission-shift control, and a retard control (col.1, lines 14-45).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 filed on April 4, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

15. In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that:

(A) Argument: Brunemann in view of Tsumura does not show that loading of the stored data is only executed in a predefined operating state.

Response: Tsumura teaches a system for automatically billing information services in conjunction with utilities services. The system includes a main unit and terminal unit. The terminal units receive data of various type tagged with a unique data identification code and they are also provided with a utilization status counter for storing data identification codes of data actually executed. Upon receiving the control signal (predefined operating state), which the main unit transmits at regular intervals to request loading of the utilization status information, each of the plurality of the terminal units loads the data to the main unit (col. 2, lines 45-60). Since the terminal units do not load the data to the main unit until the reception of a control signal, Tsumura meets the scope of the claimed limitation "loading of the stored data is only executed in a predefined operating state."

(B) Argument: Brunemann does not show a direct connection between the central provider and the vehicle.

Response: In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., direct connection between the central provider and the vehicle) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

(C) Argument: Brunemann, levy and Tsumura do not show reprogramming of a control unit.

Response: In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., reprogramming of a control unit) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2155

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawki S Ismail whose telephone number is 571-272-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shawki Ismail
Patent Examiner
May 3, 2005



ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100